UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,382	01/19/2001	Robert Betros	DISC1100	7353

25548	7590	04/21/2005

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP
4365 EXECUTIVE DRIVE, SUITE 1100
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121-2133

EXAMINER
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/766,382	BETROS ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Benjamin R Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _24 November 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-21_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-4 and 6-21_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-4, 6-21 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim 21 is new. Claim 5 is cancelled.

The amendment to the specification is accepted.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection is withdrawn in light of applicant's

amendment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment filed 11/24/04, have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim 1-4, 6-7, 10-11, 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,604,125 by Belkin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,796 by Cianfrocca et al.

Regarding claim 1,
The Belkin reference teaches a system for collaborative processing with distributed applications (Belkin: col. 2, lines 47-65), comprising:
at least one application context in which an application is executed (Belkin: col. 4, lines 45-52), the context including an application CGI for managing the application (Belkin: col. 5, lines 40-63), and a communication interface on which application data is communicated as messages (Belkin: col. 19, lines 7-17); and
a messaging bus configured to communicate the messages for processing by the application (Belkin: col. 17, lines 31-33; col. 18, lines 44-58); and
The Belkin reference teaches at least one gateway context including a gateway CGI configured for maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between the messaging bus and a remote application (Belkin: col. 3, lines 32-34; col. 4, lines 42-44), the CGI being configured to maintain the communication until termination of the remote application or the CGI (Belkin: col. 16, lines 30-31).

The Belkin reference does not explicitly state a firewall.

The Cianfrocca reference teaches communicating through a firewall (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 26-34) as well as asynchronous message oriented communications (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 11-25, lines 47-51).

The Cianfrocca reference further teaches the use of firewalls allows for heightened level of security (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 26-34).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of collaborative processing with distributed applications as taught by Belkin while employing a firewall as taught by Cianfrocca in order to provide heightened security (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 26-34).

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 10-11, 17-21 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Belkin and Cianfrocca et al.

Regarding claim 2, the system of claim 1, further comprising at least one remote application that communicates messages to the application via the messaging bus (Belkin: col. 4, lines 28-40; col. 5, lines 45-55).

Regarding claim 17, the system of claim 2, wherein the at least one remote application generates presentation data that is readable by another application (Belkin: col. 5, lines 42-44).

Regarding claim 18, the system of 17, wherein the presentation data is in a format that is readable by a web browser (Belkin: col. 4, lines 28-31).

Regarding claim 19, the system of claim 18, wherein the format of the presentation data is in HTML (Belkin: col. 5, lines 42-44).

Regarding claim 20, the system of claim 17, wherein a web browser is configured to read the presentation data (Belkin: col. 5, lines 42-44).

Regarding claim 3, the system of claim 1, further comprising a web server in communication with the application CGI (Belkin: col. 5, lines 40-63).

Regarding claim 4, the system of claim 3, wherein the application context includes an administration CGI in communication between the web server and the application CGI for receiving information about the application and providing a document for transmission by the web server (Belkin: col. 5, lines 50-63; request processing mechanism).

Regarding claim 10, the system of claim 1, wherein each application is configured to publish and subscribe message data with other applications via the messaging bus (Belkin: col. 5, lines 23-63).

Regarding claim 6, the system of claim 1, further comprising a messaging bus extension adapted for maintaining direct socket connections between the messaging bus and remote applications (Belkin: col. 4, lines 34-40).

Regarding claim 7, the system of claim 6, wherein the messaging bus extension includes a multiplexer for multiplexing one or more direct socket connections to the messaging bus (Belkin: figure 1 shows more than one client).

Regarding claim 11, the system of claim 6, wherein the messaging bus extension is configured to publish and subscribe message data between applications (Belkin: col. 5, lines 23-63).

Regarding claim 21, a system for collaborative processing with distributed applications (Belkin: col. 2, lines 47-65), comprising:
    at least one application context in which an application is executed (Belkin: col. 4, lines 45-52), the context including an application CGI for managing the application (Belkin: col. 5, lines 40-63), and a communications interface on which application data is communicated as messages (Belkin: col. 19, lines 7-17); and
    a messaging bus configured to communicate the messages for processing by the application (Belkin: col. 17, lines 31-33; col. 18, lines 44-58); and
    at least one gateway context including a gateway CGI configured for maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between the messaging bus and a remote application (Belkin: col. 3, lines 32-34; col. 4, lines 42-44), the CGI being configured to:
        a)   receive a request from the remote application (Belkin: col. 4, lines 40-45);
        b)   execute operations associated with the CGI, wherein the operations are configured to perform the two-way asynchronous communication with the remote application (Belkin: col. 16, lines 30-31); and
        c)   repeat at least one of the operations in step b) until termination of the CGI by the remote application or the CGI (Belkin: col. 16, lines 31-32).
    The Cianfrocca reference teaches communicating through a firewall (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 26-34) as well as asynchronous message oriented communications (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 11-25, lines 47-51).
    The Cianfrocca reference further teaches the use of firewalls allows for heightened level of security (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 26-34).
Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of collaborative processing with distributed applications as taught by Belkin while employing a firewall as taught by Cianfrocca in order to provide heightened security (Cianfrocca: col. 2, lines 26-34).

Claim 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,604,125 by Belkin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,796 by Cianfrocca et al in further view of U.S. Patent No 6,192,394 by Gutfreund et al.

Regarding claim 12,

The Belkin and Cianfrocca references teach the system of collaborative processing with distributed applications.

The Belkin and Cianfrocca references do not explicitly teach filtering the message data on the message bus but Cianfrocca teaches packet filtering.

The Gutfreund reference teaches a messaging bus includes a filter for filtering the message data (Gutfreund: col. 5, lines 34-36; message filtering application).

The Gutfreund reference further teaches a collaboration system that utilizes the applets use the filter to check for messages that satisfy the filtering rules (Gutfreund: col. 7, lines 24-32).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the administration CGI in communication between a web server and the application as taught by Belkin and Cianfrocca while employing message filters as taught by Gutfreund in order to find messages that meet the applications criteria (Gutfreund: col. 7, lines 24-32).

Claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Gutfreund et al and Belkin and Gutfreund.

Regarding claim 13, the system of claim 12, wherein the filter is configured to filter messages according to a filter criteria executed by each application (Gutfreund: col. 7, lines 25-32).

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,604,125 by Belkin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,796 by Cianfrocca et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,683 by Drumm et al.

Regarding claim 14,

The Belkin and Cianfrocca references teach the system of claim 4, wherein an administration GGI in communication between a web server and the application CGI.

The Belkin and Cianfrocca references do not explicitly teach formatting the data.

The Drumm reference teaches an administration CGI is configured to format application data retrieved from the application through the application CGI into presentation data that is readable by another application (Drumm: col. 6, lines 27-49).

The Drumm reference further teaches the CGI reformats the response in a format that is suitable for processing by the application server program (Drumm: col. 6, lines 35-36).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the administration CGI in communication between a web server and the application as taught by Belkin and Cianfrocca while formatting data into presentable data that is readable by another application as taught by Drumm in order to process the request by another application.

Claims 15-16 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Belkin and Cianfrocca et al and Drumm et al.

Regarding claim 15, the system of claim 14, wherein the presentation data is in a format that is readable by a web browser (Belkin: col. 4, lines 28-31).

Regarding claim 16, the system of claim 14, wherein the format of the presentation data is in HTML (Belkin: col. 5, lines 42-44).

Claims 8 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6,604,125 by Belkin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,796 by Cianfrocca et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,426,637 by Derby et al.

Regarding claim 8,

The Belkin and Cianfrocca references teach the system of claim 1 where a web server communicates with applications CGI.

The Belkin and Cianfrocca references do not explicitly mention other remote buses.

The Derby reference teaches a messaging bus is configured to communicate with one or more other messaging busses, and wherein each other messaging bus is resident on a remote host (Derby: col. 4, lines 22-31; messaging busses are the LANs).

The Derby reference further teaches a system with reduced overhead that interconnects networks to transmitting data over long distances with speeds equal to local distances (Derby: col. 2, lines 8-14).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the web server that communicates with applications with CGI as taught by Belkin and Cianfrocca references while employing messaging busses connected together as taught by Derby in order to transmitting data over long distances with speeds equal to local distances (Derby: col. 2, lines 8-14).

Claim 9 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Gutfreund et al and Derby et al.

Regarding claim 9, the system of claim 8, wherein the messaging bus is configured to communicate according to a multicast protocol (Derby: col. 14, lines 34-56).

REMARKS

Applicant has combined claim 5 into claim 1 and added a line about termination of the communication.

The Applicant Argues:

Applicant argues the Cianfrocca reference teaches away from the invention.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The rejection has been amended to better addressed the claim limitation but Cianfrocca still reads upon the claim language. Cianfrocca col. 2, lines 11-34 teaches asynchronous communication with messages across a firewall. Applicant has cited a portion of Cianfrocca but does not detail or explain how it teaches away. Just prior to the portion that applicant has cited, the Cianfrocca teaches more motivation to use this invention cause it reduces the load on the firewall.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb
        BRB

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER